DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 054 HE 024 900

AUTHOR Greene, Deborah L.
TITLE Status of Academic Research Libraries at Texas Public Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION Texas State Legislature, Austin. Senate Education Committee.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Educational Finance; Higher Education; *Law Libraries; Library Acquisition; Library Collections; Library Development; *Library Expenditures; Library Personnel; Library Statistics; *Medical Libraries; Reduction in Force; *Retrenchment; State Aid; *State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to document the impact of reductions in state appropriations on the libraries of Texas public institutions of higher education from Fiscal Year 1986 through Fiscal Year 1990 and to make recommendations for improving these libraries. Data were collected through a letter requesting information from each of the public general academic institutions including law and medical schools. All 34 institutions responded. Of those, only two reported decreases in library budgets for the period in question. Others reported increases in budgets ranging from 1 percent to over 41 percent. Forty-seven percent of the institutions reported decreases in the total number of library staff, while 32 percent reported an increase in staff. Forty-one percent of libraries reported being able to maintain library hours or at least bring them back to pre-1986 levels. However, responses from institutions indicated overall a steady decline in the rate of library acquisitions. The study also looked specifically at ways that law and medical libraries had been affected by the reduction of funds. The study includes recommendations, a copy of the survey letter, a list of respondents and four tables displaying subindexes and data. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336054

STATUS OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH LIBRARIES AT TEXAS PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
SENATOR CARL A. PARKER, CHAIRMAN

PREPARED BY: DEBORAH L. GREENE

AUSTIN, TEXAS
February, 1991

HE 024 900

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Deborah L. Greene
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATUS OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH LIBRARIES AT TEXAS PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
SENATOR CARL A. PARKER, CHAIRMAN

PREPARED BY: DEBORAH L. GREENE

AUSTIN, TEXAS
February, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	3
FINDINGS - GENERAL ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS	6
LIBRARY BUDGET	6
STAFFING	8
HOURS OF LIBRARY OPERATION	10
LIBRARY COLLECTIONS	10
IMPACT ON STUDENTS AND FACULTY	14
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES	17
IMPACT OF STATE POLICIES ON LIBRARY EFFECTIVENESS	19
SUGGESTIONS	23
FINDINGS - SPECIAL PURPOSE LIBRARIES	24
LAW LIBRARIES	24
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	25
RECOMMENDATIONS	27
CONCLUSION	30
APPENDIX A - LETTER TO UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS	32
APPENDIX B - SURVEY RESPONDENTS	33
APPENDIX C - SUBINDEXES OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS USED FOR THE HEPI: FY 1976 - 1989	34
APPENDIX D - SUBINDEXES OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS USED FOR THE HEPI: PERCENT CHANGES FROM THE PRECEDING YEAR: FY 1976 - 1989	35
APPENDIX E - LAW LIBRARY PROFESSIONAL STAFF SALARY COMPARISONS	36
APPENDIX F - TEN LARGEST STATE SUPPORTED LAW SCHOOL LIBRARIES: AMOUNT SPENT PER STUDENT	37

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Library Budgets FY 1986 through FY 1990	6
Table 2 - PUF/HEAF Monies Budgeted/Expended FY 1986 through FY 1990	7
Table 3 - PUF/HEAF Monies as a Percentage of Total Library Budget FY 1986 through Fy 1990	7
Table 4 - Library Staff from FY 1986 through FY 1990	9
Table 5 - Library Hours from FY 1986 through Fy 1990	10
Table 6 - Rate of Increase in the Acquisition of Additional Volumes from FY 1986 through Fy 1990	11
Table 7 - Serial Subscriptions Cancelled from FY 1986 through FY 1990	12
Table 8 - Impact on Accessibility of Library Materials and Services	15
Table 9 - Impact on Availability of Library Materials and Services	16
Table 10 - Additional Resources to Improve Access to Library Materials and Services	18
Table 11 - Additional Resources to Improve Availability of Library Materials and Services	19
Table 12 - State Policies that Benefit Libraries	20
Table 13 - State Policies that Impede Libraries	22
Table 14 - Suggestions for Improving Libraries	23

BACKGROUND

Many scholars have described the library as the heart of academic life in higher education. It is one of the essential elements of education and research, and is considered to be an indicator of an institution's academic health and vitality.

The libraries of Texas' public colleges and universities are ailing. They began declining in 1985 when line-item funding for general academic libraries was eliminated. The all-funds appropriation for libraries was still listed in the appropriation pattern; its non-transferability, however, was removed.

Libraries suffered another set-back in 1986 when Executive Order MW-36 directed "state agencies and universities... to achieve an overall 13% reduction in spending from existing FY 1986-87 biennial general revenue appropriation authority... not later than March 1, 1986", when one quarter of the biennium was already over.

From FY 1986 through FY 1990, public general academic libraries experienced an all-funds reduction of 14% ($8.0 million) in their state appropriations. Also, the medical libraries of five health science centers, together with the Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine, saw a 13% ($1.1 million) reduction in their state appropriations during this period. In order to maintain current levels of library operation, many libraries were forced to shift

funds from the acquisition portion of their budget to general operations.

Given these circumstances, this study was undertaken to document the impact of reductions in state appropriations on the libraries of Texas public institutions of higher education from FY 1986 through FY 1990, and to make recommendations for improving these libraries.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The Chairman of the Senate Education Committee asked Committee staff to assess the impact of reductions in state appropriations to the libraries of public institutions of higher education from FY 1986 through FY 1990. In January, 1990, staff sent letters requesting information to each of the public general academic institutions (including their law and medical schools) and health science centers (see Appendix A for the body of the letter). Responses were due back in early February, with extensions given to two institutions. All institutions responded to the request for information (see Appendix B for a list of these institutions).

Responses from the University of Texas - Pan Am at Brownsville were combined with those from the University of Texas - Pan Am in recognition of the degree-granting institution. Also, a separate response for the Uvalde Campus of Sul Ross State University was not requested. The libraries of the Texas State Technical Institute and the public community colleges were not included in this study.

It should be noted that several upper level institutions have combined libraries with the community colleges on whose campuses they are located. These shared facilities include East Texas State University at Texarkana with Texarkana College, the University of Houston at Victoria with Victoria College, and Laredo State University with Laredo Junior College.

During the study period, two institutions (Lamar University at Orange and Lamar University at Port Arthur) evolved from academic centers into independent campuses with their own appropriation formula. Legislation was enacted in 1989 to clarify their eligibility to participate in the Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF).

Responses from the five health science centers and the Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine were reviewed separately from the general academic institutions. The Texas Medical Center Library in Houston, which assesses Texas Woman's University, the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, M.D. Anderson Cancer Institute, University of Houston's College of Pharmacy, Prairie View A&M's College of Nursing, and Baylor College of Medicine for use of its facilities and materials, has been included in this study as a substitute for the response from the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

Information for the Medical Sciences Library at Texas A&M University was combined with that for the Evans Library on that campus. It should be noted that state funds for the Medical Sciences Library are budgeted through the Colleges of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine.

Responses to questions were compiled, noting similar responses from

many institutions. Similar responses were later combined into response categories. Where appropriate, numeric and percentage totals were developed.

The following narrative represents the results of the questionnaire.

FINDINGS - GENERAL ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

LIBRARY BUDGET

Of the 34 general academic institutions responding, only two (5.9%) reported decreases in their library budgets for the period FY 1986 through FY 1990 (see Table 1). Nine institutions (26.5%) reported a 1% to 10% increase in their library budgets for this period, 20.6% (N=7) cited increases between 11% and 20%, 14.7% (N=5) reported increases between 21% and 30%, and 11.8% (N=4) saw increases between 31% and 40%. Two (5.9%) institutions reported budget increases at or above 41% (see Table 1).

Table 1 - Library Budgets FY 1986 through FY 1990

Percent Increased/Decreased	Number (%) of Institutions
-1% to -10%	2 (5.9%)
+1% to +10%	9 (26.5%)
+11% to +20%	7 (20.6%)
+21% to +30%	5 (14.7%)
+31% to +40%	4 (11.8%)
+41% and above	2 (5.9%)
No response/Not available	5 (14.7%)
Total	34 (100% *)

* does not add to 100% due to rounding

Almost half (47.1%) of the institutions were unable to report the amount of Permanent University Funds (PUF) or Higher Education Assistance Funds (HEAF) that were budgeted or expended for each

year during the study period (see Table 2). As a result, these data were not analyzed.

Table 2 - PUF/HEAF Monies Budgeted/Expended FY 1986 through FY 1990

Percent Increased/Decreased	Number (%) of Institutions
-10% to -20%	2 (5.9%)
No change	2 (5.9%)
+1% to +25%	4 (11.8%)
+26% to +50%	4 (11.8%)
+51% to +75%	4 (11.8%)
+76% to +100%	1 (2.9%)
+101% and above	1 (2.9%)
No response/Not available	16 (47.1%)
Total	34 (100% *)

* does not add to 100% due to rounding

Over half (52.9%) of the institutions indicated that PUF or HEAF monies increased as a percentage of their total library budgets during the period under study (see Table 3).

Table 3 - PUF/HEAF Monies as a Percentage of Total Library Budget FY 1986 through FY 1990

Increase or Decrease	Number (%) of Institutions
Increase	18 (52.9%)
Decrease	7 (20.6%)
No response/Not available	9 (26.5%)
Total	34 (100%)

As the level of state appropriations of libraries has been reduced, many universities supplemented General Revenue funds with increasingly larger amounts of Other Educational and General funds, including HEAF, PUF, and Available University Funds (AUF). Only

with a heavy reliance on non-General Revenue funding sources have library acquisitions and services avoided a more rapid decline.

The September 1989 issue of "Library Issues", a key publication for academic libraryship, reported that rising costs of library materials exceeded the rise in costs of other consumer goods (see Appendices C and D for a subindex of books and periodicals used for the Higher Education Price Index). The impact of inflation contributed to a reduction in purchasing power so that level library budgets cannot maintain a status quo. Erosion of purchasing power, especially of foreign publications, was further highlighted in the December 1989 special issue of "Library Issues". Large research libraries, in which more than half of acquisition budgets support the purchase of foreign library materials, experienced a severe reduction in purchasing power due to the impact of the devaluation of the dollar. Acquisition of special collections, which are costly and which become available infrequently and nonroutinely, became increasingly difficult for static library budgets.

STAFFING

Almost half (47.1%) of the institutions reported decreases in the total number of library staff, while almost one-third (32.4%) reported an increase during this period. Realignments in full-time equivalent employees among professional, support, and student

employees also accompanied increased staffing to make library operations more efficient (see Table 4).

Table 4 - Library Staff from FY 1986 through FY 1990

Increase or Decrease	Number (%) of Institutions
Increase	11 (32.4%)
Decrease	16 (47.1%)
No change	5 (14.7%)
No response/Not available	2 (5.9%)
Total	34 (100% *)

* does not add to 100% due to rounding

Increases in enrollment and circulation have occurred at the same time the number of professional library positions has declined. Professional and support staff on duty to provide assistance to students and faculty has been reduced. Some institutions reported shifting funds earmarked for new positions to salary increases that were needed to retain existing staff.

One institution, Lamar University at Beaumont, reported that professional librarians' contracts were being lengthened from 10.5-month contracts to 12-month contracts to expand services.

HOURS OF LIBRARY OPERATION

Fourteen (41.2%) general academic institutions were able to maintain library hours, or were able by FY 1990 to restore them to FY 1986 levels (see Table 5). Nine (26.5%) institutions were able to increase library hours while four (11.8%) institutions saw a decrease in hours during this period.

Table 5 - Library Hours from FY 1986 through FY 1990

Increase or Decrease	Number (%) of Institutions
Increase	9 (26.5%)
Decrease	4 (11.8%)
No change	14 (41.2%)
No response/Not available	7 (20.6%)
Total	34 (100% *)

* does not add to 100% due to rounding

LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Responses from institutions indicate overall a steady decline in the rate of library acquisitions (see Table 6). The data show that academic libraries were able to add fewer books and journals to their collections each year. Although the libraries of general academic institutions added new volumes annually, the rate at which they purchase new volumes was declining. Nearly half (47.1%) of the institutions reported decreases in the annual rate of increase for the number of volumes purchased during the study period. Only four

institutions (11.8%) reported increases in the rate of volume purchases. During the study period, the University of Texas Board of Regents approved $25.1 million in supplemental PUF monies to its general academic and health-related components. Also, the Texas State University System Board of Regents allocated $1 million in HEAF monies to Angelo State University for library enhancement over a ten-year period; approximately $500,000 of this allocation was spent during the study period.

Table 6 - Rate of Increase in the Acquisition of Additional Volumes from FY 1986 through FY 1990

Increase or Decrease	Number (%) of Institutions
Increase	4 (11.8%)
Decrease	16 (47.1%)
No change	1 (2.9%)
No response/Not applicable	13 (38.2%)
Total	34 (100%)

Responses from the institutions indicated a continuing decline in the annual rate of adding new subscriptions. Almost two-thirds (N=23) of the institutions reported net reductions of serial subscriptions from FY 1986 through FY 1990 (see Table 7). Five (14.7%) institutions reported no change in the number of subscriptions to serials due to either institutional policy (e.g., for any new publications ordered, an existing subscription was cancelled) or HEAF monies used to support new purchases.

Table 7 - Serial Subscriptions Cancelled from FY 1986 - FY 1990

Cancellations	Number (%) of Institutions
None	4 (11.8%)
No change (1 for 1 swap)	1 (2.9%)
1 to 100	3 (8.8%)
101 to 200	6 (17.6%)
201 to 300	3 (8.8%)
301 to 400	1 (2.9%)
401 to 500	2 (5.9%)
501 to 1,000	4 (11.8%)
1,001 to 1,400	4 (11.8%)
No response/Not available	6 (17.6%)
Total	34 (100% *)

* does not add to 100% due to rounding

Purchasing power has been seriously eroded since 1985 due to static library materials budgets coupled with domestic inflation and fluctuations in foreign currency levels. The University of Texas at Austin reported that, in 1990, the average cost per book was $32, while domestic and West European imprints averaged $42 per title. Subscriptions averaged $110. Actual and projected purchases for the study period show libraries experienced a significant acquisitions shortfall, as derived from professional standards.

To address the need for new "cutting edge" periodicals, many institutions adopted a no-growth policy: for every new subscription, an existing one was deleted. Certain academic programs, such as the newly-approved engineering programs at the University of Texas at Dallas, were excluded from these policies.

Many institutions allocated an equal amount of funds to each major

discipline in which instruction and research are offered so that departmental faculty could select the necessary books and journals for purchase. Administrators noted that smaller library pies are being spread thinner among existing and newly-approved programs. They identified high cost program areas, such as computer science, engineering and life sciences, as suffering disproportionately more than other program areas from static library budgets because their materials tend to cost more. Yet, they receive the same amount of funds as other less costly program areas. The breadth of these collections has been severely restricted.

Ironically, monograph and books purchase have been reduced during a period of increased enrollment, additional curriculum and degree programs, and increased faculty research productivity at most institutions.

One institution highlighted problems with retrospective purchasing; that is, purchasing back issues of cancelled journal subscriptions and books not acquired when first published. New Internal Revenue Service (IRS) rules do not allow publishers to depreciate their inventory, making it less profitable for publishers to print an oversupply of books. With fewer copies being printed, libraries are experiencing irreversible gaps in collections. The ruling (IRS v. Thor Power Tools 439 US 522) has resulted in companies printing only as many books as can be sold quickly. This results in fewer books being left over to buy later. Books are on the market a much

shorter length of time than was true ten years ago.

Also, more institutions are deferring the purchasing of expensive, multi-volume sets, such as those maintained in reference collections.

IMPACT ON STUDENTS AND FACULTY

New information technology is beyond the reach of most institutions. Despite living in an information-rich environment, many institutions reported being unable to use their enhancement funds for purchasing, upgrading, and replacing those systems that make information more accessible.

Institutions were asked to identify how reductions in library appropriations affected students and faculty. The five accessibility factors cited most often were (1) created or increased fees (for recovering the cost of services) (N=3), (2) reduced services (N=3), (3) delays in getting needed materials (N=3), (4) shortages of modern equipment (N=3), and (5) inability to purchase materials in a variety of formats (N=3) (see Table 8).

Table 8 - Impact on Accessibility of Library Materials and Services

Comments	Number of Institutions
Fees created/Fees increased (Cost Recovery)	3
Services reduced	3
Delays in obtaining materials	3
Shortage of modern equipment (AV, copying)	3
Inability to buy materials in multiple formats	3
Increased staff workload	2
Inconvenience (increased travel to other libraries)	2
Lack of furniture	2
Increased expense of electronic information	1
Lack of study space	1
Delays in completion of stacks	1
Delays in online cataloguing	1
Reduced library hours during holidays	1
Increased cost for interlibrary loan	1
Reduced retrieval ability	1
Delays in obtaining equipment	1
Delays in catalogue retroconversion project	1

The five availability factors cited most often by institutions were (1) lack of support for the most sophisticated faculty, graduate, and undergraduate research and academic programs (N=8), (2) lack of books and periodicals, contributing to the degradation of the collection (N=7), (3) increased borrowing from other libraries, noting the impact of copyright laws on borrowing (N=6), (4) lack of progress in collection development (N=3), and (5) increased use of HEAF monies for library operations rather than library excellence (N=3) (see Table 9).

Table 9 - Impact on Availability of Library Materials and Services

Comments	Number of Institutions
Lack of support for the most sophisticated faculty, undergraduate, and graduate academic and research programs	8
Lack of books and periodicals (degradation of quality resources)	7
Increased borrowing from other libraries	6
Worsening of collection development	3
Increased use of HEAF for operations	3
Lack of preservation and conservation services	2
Loss of accreditation (concern about)	2
Unavailability of materials in particular program areas	2
Lack of materials for new degree programs	2
Curtailed retrospective purchasing	2
Differential impact on students in particular program areas	2
Inability to duplicate heavily used monographs	1
Inability to reshelve materials quickly	1
Inability to replace lost or worn materials	1
Deterioration of equipment	1
Modification of class assignments to fit library collection	1
Inability to buy CD-ROM bibliographies and databases	1
Loss of purchasing power	1
Difficulty encouraging faculty research and pursuit of external grants	1
Obsolescence of reference collection	1
Inability to purchase TEA-required adopted texts	1
Lack of directories and statistical information in many program areas	1
Lack of library supplies	1
Inability to purchase desired periodicals	1

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Institutions were asked how they would spend additional funds to improve their libraries. Overall, library responses stressed that they would use additional resources to improve collections and enhance services. Providing quality access services would involve both manual and automated systems. The five expenditures cited most often by institutions to enhance student and faculty access to library materials and services were (1) add staff (including restoration of staff to 1985 levels) (N=21), (2) automation of information services (N=13), (3) purchase, replace, or repair equipment (including computers) (N=12), (4) increase salaries to recruit and retain library staff (N=10), and (5) provide additional training for staff (N=4) (See Table 10).

Table 10 - Additional Resources to Improve Access to Library Materials and Services

Comments	Number of Institutions
Additional staff/restoration of staff	21
Automate information services	13
Purchase/replace/repair equipment	12
Increase staff salaries	10
Additional staff training	4
Increase hours of library operation	3
Develop guidelines for statewide resource sharing	3
Increase maintenance & operations budget	
Reclassify collection to Library of Congress	2
Develop local area network to facilitate access to online catalogues	2
Expand library building	2
Complete library stacks	1
Purchase library furniture	1
Add document delivery service	1
Reallocate staff from technical to public service	1
Add CD-ROM back-up equipment for public use	1
Improve telefax system	1
Convert non-MARC records to MARC	1
Develop improved access service program	1
Additional resource training	1
Additional resources for physically disabled	1
Additional shelving	1
Additional study space	1
Add centralized AV to campus	1
Improve interlibrary loan service	1

Many institutions noted that salary increases are essential due to mandatory increases in the minimum wage (especially critical for student workers) and compensation competitiveness to recruit and retain professional and support staff.

The three expenditures most often cited by institutions to enhance availability of materials and services were (1) improvement of collection through the restoration of the book budget (N=18), (2) improvement of collection through the restoration of serial subscriptions (including retrospective purchases to fill gaps) and the purchase of new subscriptions (N=15), and (3) improvement of collection through purchase of CD-ROM databases and subject indices (N=7) (see Table 11).

Table 11 - Additional Resources to Improve Availability of Library Materials and Services

Comments	Number of Institutions
Improve collection/restore book budget	18
Add/restore subscriptions/fill gaps	15
Add subject databases and indices	7
Expand reference service	2
Add paper conservation lab/effort	2
Add materials for each university program	2
Develop retrospective collection	2
Increase faculty book allocation	2
Expand monograph collection	1
Rebuild microfilm collection	1
Implement new security system	1
Build test collection	1
Build AV collection	1
Microfilm local and Mexican newspapers	1
Improve Learning Resource Center	1

IMPACT OF STATE POLICIES ON LIBRARY EFFECTIVENESS

Institutions were asked to identify state policies that benefit and impede library effectiveness. The five policies cited most often

by institutions as advantageous to libraries were (1) discounts on books through State Purchasing and General Services Commission's (SPGSC) statewide contracts (N=6), (2) discounts on book binding through SPGSC's statewide contracts (N=3), (3) discounts on library materials through SPGSC's statewide contracts (N=2), (4) ability to direct purchase for sole source library materials (N=2), and (5) ability to select and negotiate serial subscriptions using local contracts with periodical jobbers (N=2) (see Table 12).

Table 12 - State Policies that Benefit Libraries

Comments	Number of Institutions
Discounts on book purchases through SPGSC	6
Discounts on book binding through SPGSC	3
Discounts on library materials	2
Direct purchase of sole source materials	2
Ability to select and negotiate subscriptions with periodical jobbers using local purchasing capacity	2
Wider range of contacts for supplies and equipment	1
Certain library purchases are exempt from SPGSC	1
Allocation of HEAF allows institutions to have first rate library	1

The five policies cited most often by institutions as disadvantageous to libraries were (1) lack of full formula funding, creating inadequate library budgets (N=7), (2) inability to prepay for library books and materials (N=5), (3) requirement to seek bids for library automation systems and materials when vendors allow substantial discounts for non-bid purchases (N=5), (4) SPGSC purchasing procedures duplicate effort and paperwork completed by institutional purchasing departments (N=4), and (5) library formula

currently penalizes upper-level institutions (regardless of the fact that they generate no lower-level semester credit hours, they must maintain a full collection to support the institution's academic and research programs) (N=4) (see Table 13).

Table 13 - State Policies that Impede Libraries

Comments	Number of Institutions
Lack of full formula funding	7
Prohibition of prepayment	5
Bidding requirement for library automation systems and materials	5
Procurement process	4
Library formula	4
Prohibition of purchasing items locally if cheaper than state contract	2
State contract for books, binding, materials	2
Requirements for computer purchases	2
Inferior equipment on state contract	2
Formula funding as impediment to funding for rapidly growing institutions	2
Difficulty obtaining standardized equipment	2
Processing state documents	1
45 day payment requirement (SPGSC cannot comply as easily as institution)	1
Bidding process for binding	1
Uncertainty of funding levels	1
Review of HEAF allocation only every 5 years	1
$250 limit on object class code items	1
Lack of standardized paperwork	1
Required audit is too expensive	1
Libraries no longer have non-transferable line-item funding	1
Bidding process in general	1

Smaller schools that have only state funds available to them often cannot prepay for books from local funds. Also, small presses, which may be the only source for important materials, frequently require prepayment. An institution can often achieve significant savings when purchasing at prepublication prices.

SUGGESTIONS

Institutions were asked to make any additional comments regarding library support. The comments made most often were (1) support for statewide resource sharing (N=8), (2) development of a statewide computer network among academic libraries (N=3), and (3) development of a statewide contract for a delivery service (among libraries, to campus departments) (N=2) (see Table 14).

Table 14 - Suggestions for Improving Libraries

Comments	Number of Institutions
Statewide resource sharing	8
Statewide computer network among academic libraries	3
Contract for delivery service	2
Contract for non-book materials	1
Delegate purchasing responsibility to institutions	1
Review available insurance coverage	1
Review vacations for library staff	1
Use HEPI rather than CPI for libraries	1
Use funding formulas that recognize the difference among academic disciplines	1
Revise HEAF allocation more often than every 5 years	1

FINDINGS - SPECIAL PURPOSE LIBRARIES

LAW LIBRARIES

The University of Texas at Austin's Tarleton Law Library reported that its average professional salary ranked 107th of 170 American Bar Association accredited law libraries. The average support staff salary ranked 144th. To bring Tarleton's professional staff salaries to the level of the fifteen other major law libraries listed in Appendix C, an additional $154,000 would be required.

The University of Houston's Law Library has seen its staffing and hours of operation remain constant during the study period. At the same time, it has experienced a loss of ability to provide services to administrative agencies and to the courts.

Although Texas Southern University's Law Library budget is up 21% from 1986, its HEAF expenditures have risen 54%. HEAF monies now represent almost half (48%) of the Library's budget.

Texas Tech's Law Library had a similar experience. Although Tech's Law Library budget is up 34% from 1986, its HEAF expenditures have risen 88%. HEAF monies represent 16% of the Tech Law Library's FY 1990 budget, up 5% from 1986.

MEDICAL LIBRARIES

Between FY 1986 and FY 1990, libraries at four of five health science centers and at the Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine reported increases in their library budgets. These increases ranged from 10% to 32% over the study period. A similar pattern was shown by the general academic libraries, which were funded through formula rather than line-item appropriation.

Half (N=3) of the medical libraries indicated that PUF or HEAF monies increased as a percentage of their total library budgets during the period under study.

Half (N=3) of the medical libraries saw increases in their staff. No change in the hours of library operations were reported by four libraries.

Two-thirds (N=4) of the medical libraries reported serial cancellations ranging from 350 to 500 titles. All of the libraries experienced net reductions, with a high of 1,252 serials cut to a low of 71 serials cut.

Medical library concerns echoed those of general academic institutions with regard to accessibility and availability of library materials and services. They cited most often increases in interlibrary loan usage (N=4), and worsening special and historical collections (N=2).

Similar to the general academic libraries, additional funds would be used to purchase and repair equipment (N=3), improve the collection (N=2), enhance the information systems (N=2), expand the information sharing capacity (N=2), and restore/fill gaps in the collection (N=2).

Cited as policy benefits were SPGSC's statewide contracts for book purchasing and binding, and the ability to buy single source books directly from the publisher. Impediments included the lack of priority of library funding, and the procurement process under SPGSC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered, based on the responses provided by the public institutions of higher education.

The Texas Legislature should:

1. fully fund the library formula for public senior colleges and universities, as recommended by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and as requested by the institutions. The Coordinating Board recommended a 34% increase for 1991-92 and an additional 12.2% increase for 1992-93.

2. ensure that in the event of it appropriating less than full formula funding for libraries, the Coordinating Board-recommended minimum appropriations of $710,000 for FY 1992 and $807,500 for FY 1993 NOT BE ADJUSTED (i.e. prorated), as indicated in Note 2 of the Coordinating Board's "Recommended Formula for Library Appropriations". Any adjustment would effectively eliminate the intent of the minimum recommendations, which were established as the minimum amounts required to provide basic essential services.

3. remove library purchases from State Purchasing and General Services oversight, as was done for university-based research purchases. The Legislature should delegate purchasing responsibilities to the institutions to allow libraries to obtain supplies, materials, and equipment in a more timely and efficient

manner.

4. support the Coordinating Board's appropriation request of $3.3 million to develop and implement a statewide resource sharing plan. This plan is also supported by the Texas Council of State University Librarians.

5. establish a Library Contingency Fund, to be administered by the Coordinating Board, to assure that institutions whose libraries are cited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) as inadequate and that are subject to provisional accreditation or loss of accreditation by SACS, have resources available immediately to correct this situation. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board should appoint a committee to develop and recommend guidelines for allocating these funds.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board should:

1. through its Library Formula Study Committee, investigate the feasibility of developing a subscription cancellation policy within each University system, so that the state always has at least one institution receiving the serial for interlibrary loan or telefaxing. If feasible, the Library Formula Study Committee should develop and recommend guidelines for this policy.

2. utilize the Higher Education Price Index rather than the Consumer Price Index when developing its recommendations for

biennial library formulae as it more closely reflects the items most often purchased by university libraries.

3. through its Library Formula Study Committee, review the standards developed by American Library Association to determine how well Texas academic libraries comply with their standards. These standards "specifically address themselves to institutions defined by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as Liberal Arts Colleges I and II and Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II." These standards provide a formula for determining the minimum number of items required for a collection at these types of institutions. Library funding, according to the standard, is currently set at 6% of the total institutional budget. According to the standard, the appropriation should be increased over the 6% level for additional acquisitions and for audio/visual and microcomputer equipment. Finally, the standard suggests that between 35% and 40% of a library's budget should be allocated for the acquisition of materials.

The Texas Education Agency should:

1. investigate the feasibility of having the publishers of State Board of Education (SBOE)-approved textbooks provide a set of these books to public institutions of higher education with teacher education programs, for the purpose of the institutions meeting the TEA requirement that academic libraries maintain SBOE-approved texts in their collections.

CONCLUSION

Responses from institutions of higher education indicate a general decline in library collections and services from FY 1986 through FY 1990. This decline resulted from several factors.

Foremost, between 1986 and 1990 libraries at Texas public general academic institutions of higher education experienced a 14% reduction in state appropriations while medical libraries saw a 13% reduction. Expanded to include 1991, the last year of the present biennium, the reduction in state appropriations would be 10% over the six-year period.

Meanwhile, the cost to maintain and update book and serial collections increased. The additional cost to maintain existing serial subscriptions and purchase the same number of books as the prior year strains all components of the library budget. Increases in the number and cost of foreign books and publications have greatly reduced library purchasing power. Permanent University Fund proceeds and Higher Education Assistance Funds, originally intended to provide enhancement to higher education, have been shifted to support regular library operations. These funds are no longer available for excellence, as detailed in statute.

Additional demands are placed on university and college libraries due to continuing enrollment increases, increases in library usage

by students, faculty, and the community at-large, as well as new, emerging, and expanded academic and research programs have put additional pressure on library resources.

Advances in information technology that increase the efficiency and adaptability of library databases and indices contribute to the financial burden placed on library budgets. New technology requires new equipment, and new equipment is expensive.

If the above factors continue unabated, there will be a worsening of the condition of the academic library from which Texas public universities and colleges cannot recover.

Appendix A

Dear University President:

Senator Parker has asked Committee staff to assess the impact of reductions in state appropriations to the libraries of public institutions of higher education, from FY 1986 through FY 1990. We are interested in how any reductions may have affected your main library as well as any specialty libraries (e.g. medical or law libraries) on campus.

Recognizing reductions due to Executive Order MW-36 and appropriation levels over the last five years, please consider the following issues:

1. How have your library budgets changed over the last five years? Describe your total library expenditures and all sources of funding for each year. Be sure to separately identify HEAF and PUF-related funds.

2. How has staffing changed? Hours of operation?

3. What were the number of volumes housed in your library in 1986, what additional volumes were you budgeted to purchase, and what additional volumes were you actually able to purchase?

4. During this time period, did you suspend subscriptions to any critical publications? If so, how many? Please provide a list of these publications, if available.

5. How have these reductions affected the ability of the institution to meet the needs of students and faculty?

6. If additional funds were available, what specific recommendations do you have to improve the library's services?

7. What policies of the state benefit or impede the effectiveness of the library?

Feel free to add any comments about the impact to your library that were not covered in the questions above. Your response to these questions would be most helpful if received no later than February 2, 1990.

If you have any questions about this request, please don't hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at 512-463-0355.

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

cc: University Library Director

Appendix B

Survey Respondents

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Angelo State University
Corpus Christi State University
East Texas State University
East Texas State University at Texarkana
Lamar University at Beaumont
Lamar University at Orange
Lamar University at Port Arthur
Laredo State University
Midwestern State University
Prairie View A&M University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Sul Ross State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A&I University
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University at Galveston
Texas Southern University
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
The University of Texas at Arlington
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Dallas
The University of Texas at El Paso
The University of Texas - Pan American
The University of Texas - Pan American at Brownsville
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
The University of Texas at Tyler
University of Houston
University of Houston - Clear Lake
University of Houston - Downtown
University of Houston - Victoria
University of North Texas
West Texas State University

PUBLIC MEDICAL SCHOOLS AND HEALTH SCIENCE CENTERS

Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine
Texas Tech University Health Science Center
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

Appendix C

Subindexes of Books and Periodicals Used for the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI): FY 1976 - 1989

1983 = 100

Fiscal Year	Academic Books	College and University Periodicals	Foreign Monographs	Books & Periodicals Total * (7.0)
1976	53.5	49.9	63.7	53.6
1977	56.8	53.6	66.4	57.0
1978	59.5	57.8	74.7	61.0
1979	66.4	64.2	79.0	67.3
1980	75.3	73.3	96.7	77.5
1981	77.8	86.9	109.6	85.2
1982	88.6	94.7	116.2	94.4
1983	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1984	102.8	105.7	101.5	103.6
1985	106.2	110.3	98.9	107.5
1986	112.6	118.3	97.9	112.6
1987	119.3	134.2	113.5	123.6
1988	130.9	150.9	133.8	138.1
1989	138.7	161.3	122.5	144.1

* Beginning 1983, total = 52% U.S. Books + 34% Periodicals + 14% Foreign

Sources: Academic books, Arizona State University Library;
Periodicals, F.W. Faxon;
Foreign Monographs, U.S. Library of Congress.

Appendix D

Subindexes of Books and Periodicals Used for the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI): Percent Changes from the Preceding Year: FY 1976 - 1989

Fiscal Year	Academic Books	College and University Periodicals	Foreign Monographs	Books & Periodicals Total (7.0)
1976	15.0%	12.6%	18.3%	14.8%
1977	6.2%	7.5%	4.2%	6.3%
1978	4.8%	7.9%	12.4%	7.0%
1979	11.5%	11.0%	5.8%	10.4%
1980	13.4%	14.2%	22.4%	15.1%
1981	3.4%	18.5%	13.3%	9.9%
1982	13.8%	9.0%	6.0%	10.8%
1983	12.9%	5.6%	-13.9%	6.0%
1984	2.8%	5.7%	1.5%	3.6%
1985	3.3%	4.4%	- 2.6%	3.7%
1986	6.0%	7.2%	-1.0%	4.8%
1987	6.0%	13.4%	15.9%	9.8%
1988	9.7%	12.5%	17.9%	11.7%
1989	6.0%	6.9%	-8.4%	4.4%

Sources: Academic books, Arizona State University Library;
Periodicals, F.W. Faxon;
Foreign Monographs, U.S. Library of Congress.

Appendix E

Law Library Professional Staff Salary Comparisons

University	Average Professional Salary 1988-89
Stanford	43,764
U.C.L.A.	41,655
Berkeley	41,280
N.Y.U.	39,962
Harvard	39,689
Illinois	39,317
Michigan	37,882
Yale	36,122
Northwestern	35,307
Minnesota	34,869
Pennsylvania	33,975
Virginia	33,489
Georgetown	33,189
Columbia	33,144
Iowa	32,064
Texas	27,759
Average (excluding Texas)	37,047

Increase necessary to bring Texas to average: 33%

Source: A.B.A., 1988-1989

Appendix F

Ten Largest State Supported Law School Libraries: Amount Spent per Student on Library Materials

Institution	Amount
Iowa	$1,195
Minnesota	$1,028
Illinois	$978
Pennsylvania	$939
Washington	$904
Cal.-Berkeley	$757
Michigan	$742
U.C.L.A.	$734
Virginia	$591
Texas	$376

Source: ABA, 1988-1989